

OFFICIAL

FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

CONLEY, ROSE & TAYON, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024-6616
Telephone Number: (972) 731-2288
Fax Number: (972) 731-2289

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING PAGES IMMEDIATELY TO:

NAME: T. Nguyen
FAX: 9 1 703 305-5408
FROM: Rodney Carroll
DATE: November 21, 2002
RE:
REMARKS:

FAX RECEIVED

NOV 22 2002

GROUP 1700

Total Number of Pages (Including Cover Page): 4

OUR CLIENT/MATTER NO.: 09/678,413 US (4081-00300)
YOUR REFERENCE NO.: USSN 09/678,413

**IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES,
PLEASE CALL STEPHANIE L. HALL IMMEDIATELY**

This facsimile and the information it contains is intended to be a confidential communication only to the person or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone at the above telephone number and return the original to this office by mail.

#74
11/22/02
RHA

Atty Docket No.: 09/678,413US (4081-00300)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Eduardo J. Baralt, et al. §
Serial No.: 09/678,413 § Group Art Unit: 1764
Filed: October 2, 2000 §
For: Oligomerization of Alpha Olefins in the § Examiner: T. Nguyen
Presence of Carboxylic Acids § Confirmation No. 4378

BOX RESPONSES - NO FEE
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 21, 2002 to facsimile number 703/305,8408

Stephanie L. Hill
Signature

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner:

This submission is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 22, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

REMARKS

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cupples et al. (4,045,507). Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on November 20, 2002 wherein the obviousness rejection over Cupples was discussed. In response to the obviousness rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the Cupples reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the pending claims. According to MPEP 2142, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

FAX RECEIVED
NOV 22 2002
GROUP 1700